



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,650	04/07/2004	Ron Palmeri	ODVFP006	8494
22434	7590	10/28/2008	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER LLP			CHEN, YI	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			PAPER NUMBER	
			2442	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			10/28/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,650

Applicant(s)

PALMERI ET AL.

Examiner

YI CHEN

Art Unit

2442

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37, 42, 43, 47, 52 and 53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37, 42, 43, 47, 52 and 53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/5/2008.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Accordingly, this office action is a non-final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-14, 18, 37, 19-32, 36 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Vick et al., (US 7,082,532 B1, hereinafter Vick).

4. Regarding claim 1, Vick discloses an interoperability system for providing access to a plurality of services by a plurality of users having associated client machines, each of the plurality of users being associated with one of a plurality of independent enterprises, the plurality of services being associated with and controlled by a plurality of independent service providers, (the users use log in to identify themselves, col. 3, lines 50-60, then can access services through different servers, the servers are

belonged to different enterprises, col. 2, lines 55-67), and employing a plurality of interfaces at least some of which are not directly interoperable, (different website cannot interoperable without valid id, col. 6, lines 40-50), the system comprising:

at least one data store having a directory stored therein which maps an identity corresponding to each of the users to a policy framework which defines access policies relating to the services, the identity for each user identifying the associated enterprise, (the users can log in, if the users ID and password are authenticated, the web server will contain users information, col. 3, lines 50-67, users will only allow to access specific services, col. 4, 15-25), the at least one data store also having a plurality of rich client objects stored therein which are operable to be launched within browser environments on the client machines, and to interact with the services via the interoperability system, (based on the log in, the users can access specific website, the server upload the http webpage (client object) to the users, col. 3, lines 50-60, col. 4, lines 15-26, and users can access different services); and

at least one computing device which is operable to connect with each of the client machines and each of the interfaces associated with the services, to selectively upload the rich client objects to the client machines with reference to the directory, (based on the log in, the users can access specific website, the server upload the http webpage (client object) to the users, col. 3, lines 50-60, col. 4, lines 15-26), and to selectively facilitate interaction among the uploaded rich client objects and the services with reference to the directory and the policy framework, (users can access different enterprise service through the webpage, col. 3, lines 35-40), thereby enabling the

users associated with different ones of the enterprises to independently access the plurality of services using the interoperability system, (col. 3, lines 50-60, col. 4, lines 15-26).

5. Regarding claim 19, Vick discloses a computer-implemented method for providing access to a plurality of services by a plurality of users having associated client machines, each of the plurality of users being associated with one of a plurality of independent enterprises, the plurality of services being associated with and controlled by a plurality of independent service providers, (the users use log in to identify themselves, col. 3, lines 50-60, then can access services through different servers, the servers are belonged to different enterprises, col. 2, lines 55-67), and employing a plurality of interfaces at least some of which are not directly interoperable, (different website cannot interoperable without valid id, col. 6, lines 40-50), the method comprising:

selectively transmitting rich client objects to the client machines, the rich client objects being operable to be launched within browser environments on the client machines, and to interact with the services in accordance with a directory which maps an identity corresponding to each of the users to a policy framework which defines access policies relating to the services, (based on the log in, the users can access specific website, the server upload the http webpage (client object) to the users, col. 3, lines 50-60, col. 4, lines 15-26, and users can access different services), the identity for each user identifying the associated enterprise, (the users can log in, if the users ID

and password are authenticated, the web server will contain users information, col. 3, lines 50-67, users will only allow to access specific services, col. 4, 15-25), and selectively facilitating interaction among the transmitted rich client objects and the services in accordance with the directory and the policy framework, (users can access different enterprise service through the webpage, col. 3, lines 35-40), thereby enabling the users associated with different ones of the enterprises to independently access the plurality of services using a single system, (col. 3, lines 50-60, col. 4, lines 15-26).

6. Regarding claim 2, Vick discloses selected ones of the rich client objects are operable to interact with each other on the client machines, (col. 6, lines 27-35).
7. Regarding claim 3, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to connect with a first one of the client machines in response to a sign-on request, (col. 3, lines 54-64).
8. Regarding claim 4, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to upload at least one of the rich client objects during a sign-on process initiated by the sign-on request, (upload logon page to the users, col. 3, lines 55-60).
9. Regarding claim 5, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to upload at least one of the rich client objects in response to a subsequent request for

a corresponding one of the services subsequent to the sign-on process, (users able to access different webpage (rich client objects) after sign on, col. 3, 50-60).

10. Regarding claim 6, Vick discloses The system of claim 1 wherein the at least one computing device is operable to facilitate interaction with the services using previously installed rich client objects on the client machines, (col. 6, lines 25-35).

11. Regarding claim 7, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to configure the policy framework for a particular one of the services in response to input received from the service provider of the particular service, (col. 6, lines 25-35).

12. Regarding claim 8, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to configure the policy framework for at least one of the users in response to input received from an authorized representative of the enterprise associated with the at least one user, (col. 6, lines 25-35).

13. Regarding claim 9, Vick discloses the policy framework specifies any of access, authentication, and encryption policies for each of the services, (valid ID and password allow users to access specific web servers, col. 5, lines 23-38)

14. Regarding claim 10, Vick discloses each user identity includes any of the enterprise associated with the user, a role within the enterprise associated with the

user, and an identifier of the client machine associated with the user, (web server only recognizes the valid users, col. 5, lines 39-55), (col. 3, lines 40-45).

15. Regarding claim 11, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to connect with each of the client machines using any of HTTP, HTTPS, FTP, Secure FTP, EDI, INT, AS2, SMTP, and SOAP, (col. 3, lines 40-45).

16. Regarding claim 12, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to connect with each of the interfaces using any of HTTP, HTTPS, FTP, Secure FTP, EDI, INT, AS2, SMTP, and SOAP, (col. 3, lines 40-45).

17. Regarding claim 13, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to connect with selected ones of the client machines directly via a public wide area network, (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 25-41).

18. Regarding claim 14, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to connect with selected ones of the client machines via an enterprise network associated with the enterprise associated with the users corresponding to the selected client machines, (col. 8, lines 4-13).

19. Regarding claim 18, Vick discloses selective facilitation of the interaction includes facilitation of interaction between two or more of the services, (col. 4, lines 25-42),

thereby providing access to a composite service by at least some of the users, (more than two users, col. 5, lines 22-36).

20. Regarding claim 37, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is further operable to facilitate consumption of the services in a unique manner for each user in accordance with the corresponding identity, (users can access specific webpage depended on their ID and password, col. 4, lines 15-27)

21. Regarding claims 20-32, 36 and 47, they are method claims corresponding to the interoperability system claims 2-14, 18 and 37. They are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 15-17, 42-43, 33-35 and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Vick as applied to claims 1, 19, 37 and 47, in view of McLain et al., (US 6,493,758 B1).

24. Regarding claim 15, Vick does not disclose the at least one computing device is operable using the policy framework to allow selected ones of the client machines to retain selected ones of the uploaded rich client objects and other uploaded data when the selected client machines are not connected to the system.

McLain discloses the at least one computing device is operable using the policy framework to allow selected ones of the client machines to retain selected ones of the uploaded rich client objects and other uploaded data when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, (download the html document from the website to the local hard drive, Fig 1, col. 3, lines 30-40, lines 50-65).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of McLain with the teachings of Vick because the users can still access the webpage when the users cannot connect to the network.

25. Regarding claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15 above, in addition, McLain discloses the at least one computing device is operable to receive offline data generated and cached by the selected uploaded rich client objects when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, (Fig 1, col. 3, lines 30-40, lines 50-65), the offline data being received by the at least one computing device when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (col. 4, lines 1-6)

26. Regarding claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15 above, in addition, McLain discloses the at least one computing device is operable to

generate and cache offline data relating to the selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the at least one computing device further being operable to transmit the offline data to the selected client machines when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (col. 3, lines 50-76, col. 4, lines 1-6).

27. Regarding claim 42, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15 above, in addition, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to receive offline data generated and cached by selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, (Fig 1, col. 3, lines 30-40, lines 50-65), the offline data being received by the at least one computing device when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (col. 4, lines 1-6)

28. Regarding claim 43, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15 above, in addition, Vick discloses the at least one computing device is operable to generate and cache offline data relating to selected client machines when the selected client machines are not connected to the system, the at least one computing device further being operable to transmit the offline data to the selected client machines when the selected client machines reconnect to the system, (col. 3, lines 50-76, col. 4, lines 1-6).

29. Regarding claims 33-35 and 52-53, they are method claims corresponding to the interoperability system claims 15-17 and 42-43. They are rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YI CHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2442

Yi Chen
10/11/2008